

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on December 10, 2007.

Claims 1, 8, 10, and 16 are amended; claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, and 22-30 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, and 12-21 are now pending in this application.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 10 was objected to due to informalities. The dependency of claim 10 was changed to dependent from 8 as requested by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is now a moot point.

### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10-15 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner has objected to the usage of “and” in the phrase “content and metadata” in the claims; asserting that the specification states “or.” Applicant has removed the references to metadata and kept just “content” in the claims. Therefore, the rejections based on section 112 are no longer appropriate and are in fact moot.

### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. (U.S. 6,081,900). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each and every limitation must be taught or suggested in the reference or proposed combination of references cited.

Firstly, Applicant would like to object to the position of the Examiner that the border server is obvious to be external. The Subramaniam reference deals with making internal firewall access to content be supplied in a secure manner by transforming the URL's of internally acquired content. The process of going into a firewall environment and then making external

references to other external sites that are external to the firewall and that are referenced via insecure links is not something readily achievable and known in the art. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner cannot simply take every limitation in isolation from the remaining limitations and assume these are known in the industry. It is the combination of limitations that make the invention unique. Applicant respectfully does not believe that individual limitations standing alone can be extracted in isolation and used to render the invention obvious.

The Subramaniam reference described situation where resources controlled by a secure network but referenced within the secure network by an authenticated client could be delivered back to the client in a secure fashion. Applicant described this scenario on page 6 in the penultimate paragraph of the original filed specification. Most times if such external references were even permitted in the art security warnings were generated and issued to the client.

The scenario is that an external client authenticates to a secure environment, such as an enterprise's Intranet, once a session is established a variety of references can be made by that client for resources (e.g., web pages, etc.). In Subramaniam, the issue directed to accessing secure network resources within the firewall that are referenced internally via an insecure protocol was addressed and this was achieved by transforming URL references of these types of resources to be secure (HTTPS). Subramaniam did not address when a resource was referenced outside the secure network (firewall) by the authenticated client. That is what this invention is designed to address.

The Examiner is invited to view FIG. 1 of Subramaniam and related discussion. Moreover, it appears the Examiner has recognized this fact because the Examiner appears to be asserting that the location of where the reference is directed is trivial. This is not the case, the entire original disclosure of the Applicant is directed to why this is of significance. An externally established connection to a secure environment often includes a variety of issues associated with it and policies used to address interaction. One aspect was addressed by Subramaniam where internal resources that are internally addressed within the firewall are not addressed using secure protocols so there is a potential for issues if delivered to the client that way. Another issue, not addressed by Subramaniam, is what if that external client attempts to reference a resource outside the scope of the secure environment. Conventionally, such a

situation results in two scenarios one a warning message or two the client is denied since the access may introduce viruses etc. into the secure network.

Applicant provided a solution that is defined in the claims, namely pre-acquiring the content on behalf of the client and inspecting it within the secure site. This is not done and not shown or even addressed in Subramaniam and it is not something the art addressed. Therefore, Applicant asserts this is not a design choice and is not trivial as the Examiner appears to assert, when this is combined with the other interaction of the claims it is novel.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of record be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 10, 12, 14, 15 and 18-21 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. in view of "Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide Version 3.5 for Unix", 1997, hereinafter Netscape\_unix\_v3.5. These claims are all dependent from amended independent claims; therefore, in view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the corresponding amended independent claims, the rejections of claims 10, 12, 14-15 and 18-21 should be withdrawn and these claims allowed. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

#### Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official

Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

### CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(513) 942-0224

Date 03/10/08

By /  /  
Joseph P. Mehrle  
Reg. No. 45,535